

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 3 and 10 contain allowable subject matter. On the other hand, the Office Action rejected claims 1-2, 5-9, 12-13, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over US 2001/0014952 to Furukawa in view of US 6,567,931 to Jue. Claims 4 and 11 were rejected on the same basis in further view of US 6,266,776 to Sakai. Claim 14 was rejected in the same basis as claim 13, in further view of US 7,034,585 to Kiani. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration for at least the following reasons.

Claim Amendments

Applicant has made a cosmetic amendment to paragraph 0029 of the specification to correct a minor informality noted during the review of this application.

The Office Action objected to claims 6-7, 15, and 17 because of certain noted informalities. Applicant has amended the claims to appropriately address and overcome these objections.

Applicant has also amended claims 6-9, 11, 15, and 17, and Applicant has cancelled claim 10. With regard to substantive claim amendments made to claims 8, 9, and 11, Applicant notes that these amendments are fully supported by the original application, including paragraph [0023] in the detailed description. Accordingly, no new matter is introduced to the application through these claim amendments.

Further Remarks

As noted above, the Office Action rejected claims 1-2, 5-9, 12-13, and 15-17 of present application under the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Furukawa

et al., US Publication 20010014952, hereinafter Furukawa, in view of Jue, US Patent 6,567,931. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Independent claim 1 recites:

1. A method for reducing the possibility of cold reset in a computer system that includes a central processing unit (CPU), **a wake-up button that is used to awaken the CPU from a sleep mode**, and a battery that supplies power to the computer system, the CPU supporting the function of software battery fault handling, and the method comprising :

when the CPU is in the sleep mode and the computer system's power supply is in an uncertain status, the CPU staying in the sleep mode even a wake-up event occurs; and

when the CPU is in the sleep mode and the period during which the wake-up button is pressed is less than a predetermined value, the CPU continues to stay in the sleep mode.

(*Emphasis added.*) Claim 1 patently defines over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest the features emphasized above.

In contrast to the sleep mode of the claimed embodiments, Furukawa instead discloses a SUSPEND/RESUME button 3. If the SUSPEND/RESUME button 3 is pressed while the processing part 4 is in a normal operation state, the processing part 4 controls operations to go to a SUSPEND state. If the SUSPEND/RESUME button is pressed while the process part 4 is in a SUSPEND state, the processing part 4 returns to the normal operation state. Further, if the SUSPEND/RESUME button is pressed for a predetermined of time (for instance, four seconds), the processing part 4 is directly controlled to shut off the power (see Furukawa's paragraphs [0012]-[0014]). Applicant notes that the processing part 4, when in a SUSPEND state, can return to the normal operation state **as long as** the SUSPEND/RESUME button 3 is pressed. In other words,

the processing part 4 can return to be the normal operation state **even if the SUSPEND/RESUME button 3 is pressed for less than a predetermined time.**

This operation is different than the claimed embodiments. Specifically, in the claimed embodiments, when the CPU is in the sleep mode and the period during which the wake-up button is pressed is less than a predetermined value, the CPU continues to stay in the sleep mode. As described above, if the SUSPEND/RESUME button 3 of Furukawa is pressed for a predetermined of time, then the process part 4 is **not controlled to resume, but is instead controlled to proceed directly to shut off the power.** For at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The secondary reference of Jue discloses a power management for a computer system to prevent false remote system wake events following AC power loss. In the operation, the reset handing routine bypasses the wakeup routine, if it is determined that an invalid event occurred in the computer system. (Jue' at Col. 1, lines 8-11; and col. 3, lines 44-46) However, Jue fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 1, which were described above as being missing from Furukawa. As such, the embodiments of claim 1 are neither disclosed nor suggested by Furukawa alone nor in combination with Jue. For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 patently defines over the cited art. Dependent claims 2 and 5-7 patently define over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Turning now to independent claim 13, this claim includes (among other distinguishing features) the features of "when the computer system is in the sleep mode and the delay protection circuit has detected that the period during which the wake-up button is pressed is less than a predetermined value, then the CPU continues to stay in

the sleep mode.” These defining features are similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 13 and dependent claims 15-17 patently define over the applied references for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with independent claim 1.

In addition, the Office Action has admitted that none of the references cited, either alone or in combination, discloses or render obvious the computer system of original claim 10. Claim 8 has been amended herein to incorporate this allowable subject matter, and for at least this reason claim 8 patently defines over the cited art. Claims 9 and 12 depend from claim 8, and therefore patently define over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Claims 4 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Furkawa and Jue as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sakai. As Sakai fails to disclose or suggest the features recited in claims 1 and 8 missing from Furkawa and Jue, it is submitted that claims 4 and 11 are patentable over the applied references for at least the same reasons as independent claims 1 and 8.

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Furkawa and Jue as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kiani. Since Kiani fails to disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 1 (which are missing from Furkawa and Jue), claim 14 is patentable over the applied references for at least the same reasons.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-9 and 11 to 17 should be allowed.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Notice of such allowance and passing of the application to issue, are earnestly requested. Should the Examiner feel that a conference would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response to Office Action. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
100 Galleria Pkwy, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500